

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Tucson Field Office

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: *FY14_0024_DNA_Tombstone_AML_Remediation*

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N/A

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Tombstone High Hazard Mine Closure

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T20S, R22E, Secs 15, 21, 22, 27

APPLICANT (if any): None

A. **Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures that are part of the Proposed Action.** 77 Abandoned mine shafts and prospect pits will be filled with waste rock. These 77 mine features occur from 1 to 4 miles south of Tombstone AZ and east of Charleston Road. The project will occur from October to December 2014. The purpose of the project is to reduce and eliminate hazards at the subject mine features.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Phoenix Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: 1988

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions): The Phoenix RMP does not specifically address remediation of AML hazards, but subsequent BLM policy outlined in BLM Manual 3720 establishes the requirement to protect the public by remediating hazards at AML features on public land.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

NEPA # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0029-EA: Remediation of Hazards at 58 AML Adits, Shafts, Prospect Pits and Trenches in Tombstone Project Area of the Tucson Field Office

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial? The project occurs in the same project area analyzed in DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0029-EA. Resource conditions are identical.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Environmental concerns, interests, and resource values are identical to those addressed in DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0029-EA

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Information and circumstances related to rangeland health, endangered species listings and BLM sensitive species is not substantially or significantly different from that addressed in DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0029-EA.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The direct, indirect and cumulative effects from the project as proposed are not additive or substantially different compared to those elements analyzed in DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0029-EA.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. Per BLML policy, mine claimants were notified by registered mail and provided a 30 day period to identify mine features they might require to be left open. No mine claimants responded.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
-------------	--------------	------------------------------------

Amy Sobiech, BLM Archaeologist provided Class I clearance. Project impacts no known archaeologic or historic features identified in the Class I survey.

Linda Dunlevey, BLM Realty Specialist provided LR 2000 claimant search and ROW investigation.

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Keith Hughes, NRS	10/17/2014
Project Lead, Title	Date

/s/ Amy Markstein	10/17/2014
Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Date

/s/ Viola Hillman, Field Manager	10/17/2014
Authorized Signing Official, Title	Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.